ORIGINAL M

1	IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA 2 2 2010
2	IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF YAVAPAIJEANNE HICKS, Clerk
3	Deputy
4	THE STATE OF ARIZONA,
5	Plaintiff,)
6	vs.) No. CR 2008-1339
7	STEVEN CARROLL DEMOCKER,
8	Defendant.)
9	
10	
11	BEFORE: THE HONORABLE THOMAS B. LINDBERG JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT
12	DIVISION SIX YAVAPAI COUNTY, ARIZONA
13	Invitini occurry includin
14	PRESCOTT, ARIZONA TUESDAY, MARCH 10, 2009
15	10:53 A.M.
16	REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
17	HEARING ON MOTIONS
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	ROXANNE E. TARN, CR Certified Court Reporter
25	Certificate No. 50808

MARCH 10, 2009 10:53 A.M.

HEARING ON MOTIONS

APPEARANCES:

FOR THE STATE: MR. MARK AINLEY.
FOR THE DEFENDANT: MR. JOHN SEARS.

THE COURT: This is State versus Steven

Carroll DeMocker, CR 2008-1339. Mr. DeMocker is present in custody. Mr. Sears is here representing him. Mr. Ainley is here for the County Attorney's office representing the State.

And we are set on two matters this morning, motion for re-examination of conditions of release, and also defendant's request for extension for filling a new motion for finding probable cause.

Mr. Ainley.

MR. AINLEY: Judge, if I can for just a second, I would like to hijack us and take us in a different direction.

I am just giving a copy of this motion for release of divorce records to Mr. Sears. Back in February, we issued a subpoena duces tecum to the office of Bob Fruge. Mr. Fruge responded to our subpoena duces tecum and advised us that after consulting with the state bar, they said we should get a court order for the release of the documents. Mr. Fruge has indicated he is willing to give us

the documents, but requires a Court order first.

THE COURT: Mr. Sears, do you have objections to that? I don't know what your position is.

MR. SEARS: I don't know. We received a copy of a similar subpoena. We didn't receive a copy of that particular subpoena, but we found out in other ways that the subpoena had been issued, because there was a similar subpoena issued for Anna Young's records, and, of course, that is different because her client is ready, willing and able to waive any applicable privilege.

I am a little reluctant to say I have no objection to a motion that just says, please give us a court order without any authority for that proposition from either the State or Mr. Fruge or the state bar ethics counsel as to why it is appropriate for the Court to do that.

I think there are a couple of competing issues that I can think of regarding the privilege and whether the privilege -- I hate to say this -- but died with Miss Kennedy, or whether there was still some privilege that is assertible by her estate, for example, and I don't know the answer to that, and I have not been asked to weigh in on that, but --

THE COURT: So you would like your response time is what you are telling me?

MR. SEARS: I think so. I think so.

It may well be, and if I can come to a quick answer that is consistent with what Mr. Fruge is telling the State and advising the Court, then I will do that right away. But I would like to take a look to see whether or not there is a privilege that could be asserted by Katie DeMocker on behalf of the estate.

THE COURT: Obviously, you, on behalf of Steven DeMocker, don't necessarily have standing to insist upon the rights of somebody else, but I will accept a briefing on the issue from you as an interested party and friend of the Court. So I will not sign this today, but I will give you until the 20th to file a response.

MR. SEARS: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Mr. Ainley, is this the original?

MR. AINLEY: Yes, sir, it is.

THE COURT: I will direct the clerk to file stamp that and accept it for filing today in court.

MR. AINLEY: Second thing, Judge.

On January 6, 2009, Mr. Sears filed a notice of filing of the defendant's passport. It is the passport that was received -- the duplicate passport that you heard testimony concerning. The State would like to get a copy of that passport, so I have prepared an order for unsealing of the passport, copying of the passport by the

clerk's office, and supplying it to the sheriff's office, and re-sealing the passport.

THE COURT: Objections?

MR. SEARS: No.

THE COURT: I will sign that order, absent any objection. And I will direct the clerk to accept that for filing, as well, today.

MR. AINLEY: That is all I have. I will let Mr. Sears redirect us back to where we should have been.

THE COURT: Mr. Sears.

MR. SEARS: Could I take us down one more exit before we get back on the freeway?

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. SEARS: Judge, I had filed a motion last week to extend the time for the filing of the motion for new finding of probable cause. The background behind that was that last Monday, a week ago yesterday, I ran into Mr. Ainley in your courtroom, and asked him if he would oppose an extension. He asked me how long. I hadn't really thought about it. I said two weeks. He said that would be fine. I got back and circulated that information among the defense team, particularly those people responsible for doing a lot of the drafting work on that. And they asked, based on their own schedules and travel schedules out of state, if we might get one additional week to April 1.

I sent Mr. Ainley an e-mail. I got a message back saying Mr. Ainley would prefer we stick to our original agreement, which was an extension for two weeks or until the 24th of March.

read the transcript. It is 154 pages. There are four witnesses in this presentation. There is some different information, some of the same information. It requires a great deal of work, and that, coupled with the schedule of the attorneys, investigators that are working on this, make a two-week extension problematic. We can be sure that we would have a motion filed on or before April 1, if we could have that period of time.

I don't mean to embarrass or show up

Mr. Ainley. When he asked me how long, I was not fully
informed. I said two weeks. If I had had a little more
presence, I probably would have said let me get back to you
on that, and that is where we are.

I would ask that the Court grant us an extension of time to and including April 1 to file this motion.

THE COURT: That's not down another exit.

That is one of the things that was on schedule for today, but I appreciate that.

Mr. Ainley.

1 MR. AINLEY: Judge, my concern was simply that 2 Mr. Sears told me at that point in time that a decision 3 hadn't been made yet as to whether a motion was going to be 4 I thought two weeks was plenty of time to -- well, 5 the 25 days plus another two weeks was plenty of time to have gone through this record. 6 7 Defense counsel sent the State -- I think 8 it was a four or five page list of things that the defense 9 wanted the State to present during the grand jury 10 presentation, and the State did its best to comply with that. 11 When you ask for five pages of material, you can't complain 12 when the transcript is a hundred or 255 pages long, because 13 it is going to take a while to present the information that 14 they requested. So I thought the original 25 days plus 15 16 two weeks was reasonable. THE COURT: Does that take us to March 24? 17 18 MR. AINLEY: It does. 19 So you are willing to stipulate to THE COURT: 20 an extension through March 24, but not to April 1st? 21 MR. AINLEY: Yes, sir. 22 THE COURT: Mr. Sears, anything else? 23 MR. SEARS: Your Honor, we are by no means 24 complaining about the length of the presentation.

simply noting that the parsing of this presentation, in view

25

of the Court's detailed rulings regarding the first motion for new finding, will take additional time. There is much more detailed evidence about some of the things that the Court was concerned about the first time.

We continue to get disclosure from the State as recently as the end of last week in this case. It is, obviously, an on-going process. And the particular concern I have is that one of my co-counsel, who would be the principal drafter of this, is going to be out of state on another case one of the two weeks that I had asked for. So what I am asking for is a net two weeks, that we give her the full two weeks to do this.

We had made the decision, just for the State's edification and the Court's edification, we are going to file the motion. We are past that point now, but we do need the extra time to do all the work necessary.

It is more complex than the first case, because we have to not only review it as a whole, we have to go back and look at how the State responded, if at all, to the previous orders of the Court regarding certain matters. And also the Trebus letter that we sent is actually eight pages long.

There is a considerable amount of information that we think is important in this case.

THE COURT: I will grant the extension only

through the 24th, but I will sign the order today that does grant that extension, which I will direct the clerk to file.

MR. SEARS: Thank you.

THE COURT: Moving back onto the main issue of today's hearing, motion for re-examination of conditions of release.

Mr. Sears.

MR. SEARS: Thank you.

Your Honor, we filed a motion sometime after the Court's order of January 22nd finding that the defendant was bondable and setting bond in that matter in the amount of two-and-a-half million dollars, asking for an opportunity pursuant to Rule 7.4(b) of the rules of criminal procedure to provide the Court with additional material, information and evidence, which the Court, we believe, did not have available at the time the initial bond was set. And today, we think the hearing is the time to present that additional information.

What I want to do in the time we have here this morning, Your Honor, is to try and give you a complete and comprehensive picture of the finances of my client, and also the financial position of his parents, and then also of his eight brothers and sisters and their family, who are the people who would be in a position to contribute financially both to the defense costs in this case, but also

to the cost of a bond through a bondsman, both in terms of raising money for a premium and posting assets for collateral.

I also want to talk about the allegations that have been made by the State that the defendant is a flight risk, and how we think that the true version of those events would impact on the Court's decision in determining whether to reduce the bond, and if so, to what level and under what additional conditions.

I also want to talk to the Court this morning about electronic monitoring, GPS monitoring in particular, which is a more high-tech version of the kind of ankle bracelet monitoring that was available a few years ago. And I provided the Court at the time we filed our motion with some information from a vendor here in Prescott, who is a representative of a national company, who has the capability to provide and service and monitor the equipment in this case on very short notice at the defendant's expense. And I also have some information I am going to provide the Court today about the experiences in Maricopa County with electronic monitoring and how that interfaces with their pretrial services program.

And I want to talk in specific terms about the statutory factors in A.R.S. 13-3967 that the Court is obligated to consider, on one level or another, in

determining what the appropriate release conditions should be.

If I could start with the finances,

Judge. I have provided the clerk, and I have extra copies

for the Court, with a series of eight-and-a-half by eleven

versions, for those of us -- me primarily, who are somewhat

visually challenged and might have trouble seeing those

charts on the board -- and I can give you the first one is -
I provided Mr. Ainley with a copy of these, as well -- this

is eight-and-a-half by eleven of what I have on the chart

here.

Judge, I think you must have some sense from the evidence that was presented at the Simpson hearing in this case and also in other proceedings about the devastating effect that Mr. DeMocker's arrest about four and a half months ago has had on him personally and his finances, and the disastrous effect of that consequence has to be taken in the context of what his finances were just prior to the death of his former wife in this case. And you heard in considerable detail from his divorce attorney what those circumstances were.

Just to remind the Court, in general terms, during the period of time in the period of years leading up to the death of Carol Kennedy in July of last year, Mr. DeMocker had been on a steadily upward tick in his

own personal earnings. And the records show that year against year, particularly once he moved over to UBS, he was earning more and more compensation in his work as a financial advisor. But there were commensurate increases in all of his expenses. His daughters grew older. There was private school. There was college. There were automobiles for young women who weren't driving yet at the time of the separation, and there were two households to run. And in general terms, Mr. DeMocker had the responsibility for five years, first on a voluntary basis, and then for the last year plus once the divorce was filed, pursuant to court order, to pay all of the expenses of the family.

Miss Kennedy was either unemployed or employed at very modest

wages.

So the burden to service all of the obligations of both families, the Carol Kennedy family and the house at Bridle Path, and his own household and expenses and the expenses of their daughters, fell entirely on Mr. DeMocker. As a result, the financial circumstances were, as Anna Young described them to you, that Mr. DeMocker had two homes. They were heavily mortgaged with now, unfortunately, in the down-turned real estate economy, either no equity or negative equity. There was a considerable amount of debt, a lot of it credit card debt but also some other obligations, and nothing else particularly in the way

of assets to point to.

1.8

Mr. DeMocker said in the divorce, and would have been able, clearly, as he has put it, to spend his way through these obligations. That he generated significant income particularly for this community, to the extent that his ability to pay all of these obligations for the four and a half years prior to the court order was not a particular problem, and his ability to continue to pay all of these obligations after the divorce, including the spousal maintenance to his wife, were not going to be a particular problem for him.

The fact of his particular financial structure, though, essentially set him up to be in this position, if suddenly the rug were pulled out from under him, as it was when he was arrested on October 23rd. All of a sudden his income went from big numbers, sometimes as much as \$40,000 a month, to zero. He was placed quickly on administrative leave, unpaid administrative leave by his employer. That is the status today, more than eight months down the road. But he has had no income, except for some very small commission checks that came in shortly after his arrest.

And as a result, the debt structure that he would have been able easily to service has become a crushing obligation. What I put up here on the board, Your

Honor, is an attempt to show in general terms -- there is much more behind this -- in general terms, the major fixed obligations -- there is nothing in here for food or for entertainment or travel or unexpected expenses. For example, his daughter Charlotte, who is in court here today, several weeks ago had a unexpected emergency appendectomy, which was that couldn't have been planned for. Would have been no particular problem for him to cover financially had he been out of jail and working, but is another burden that is not reflected on this chart.

If you look here in this chart in the top portion, house plus vehicles plus loans. These are the major fixed obligations here. The total of these obligations on a monthly basis, and these are essentially — the monthly cost is either the fixed payment or the amount that the creditors are now demanding — excluding the obligations to Bridle Path are \$7,630 a month. Through today we estimate that of those fixed obligations, which are house payments including the mortgages, the home equity loans, there is nearly \$25,000 in arrears today. It is actually much more than that, but these are the amounts that the creditors would require to reinstate these obligations immediately. The actual amount in arrears could be considered to be much more than that. The total remaining obligations on those debts is about \$475,000.

If you look at the Bridle Path

circumstance, there is no entry for monthly cost. The Bridle Path mortgages are in default. A foreclosure is scheduled for March 31st. There is an amount to reinstate that and to hold off the foreclosure of \$21,418. That includes fees, the attorneys fees, the kinds of things that are typically folded into a reinstatement amount on a defaulted mortgage. That is just the first mortgage. The first mortgage holder is the one who has noticed the trustee sale.

The remaining obligation on the first mortgage is \$377,000. The home equity loan, which is only in Steve DeMocker's name is almost \$72,000, and it is behind at least one payment.

So you can see that based just on these fundamental obligations, not taking into consideration any other kind of either non-recurring expense or extraordinary expense, or much less attorneys fees or costs or defense costs or anything else, the financial situation for Steve DeMocker has gone from manageable to crisis level in a short period of time. And the only reason that it is not worse than this is that the family, principally his parents, have done the best they can to funnel money or to allow the small amount of money that was received in these commission checks to be parceled out in a careful way to try and keep some of these wolves away from the door for as long as it has happened.

The reason it is important is during this period of time, Mr. DeMocker's younger daughter Charlotte, who is still in high school, has been living in the townhouse in Alpine Meadows, and her Aunt Sue, who is in the courtroom here, has been in town and basically put her own life on hold and the lives of her own children to come out here and be available, both to help with the defense as an investigator using her considerable skills, but also to be a parent to Steve's daughter during this period of time, and trying to make the very best of what they can on an extremely limited and austere stipend, trying to keep this alive. There is no money available and has been no money available to pay these obligations for a long period of time now.

We are really talking about a situation that has cratered since October in the four-and-a-half months since his arrest. Prior to that, Mr. DeMocker was, of course, working and earning money and able to meet these obligations on his own. This is a financial picture of what really has happened since his arrest on October 23rd.

The bottom of this chart, we have summarized, essentially, a net worth, that if you add in the obligations, the assets -- we put a value of \$275,000 on the townhouse. We continue to monitor sales of comparable townhouses. This is in an area of the Hassayampa where there are a number of similar or close to similar townhouses that

have been on the market. Prior to September of last year when the real estate market abruptly went south, those townhouses were selling for, perhaps, close to a number that would allow Mr. DeMocker to at least walk away from the townhouse.

Since then, there have been virtually no sales. There was one short sale, and our latest information is on a short sale that may have closed yesterday, but the number that we have picked here is only slightly more than Mr. DeMocker paid for the townhouse to begin with a number of years ago when he and Carol separated.

He has a motorcycle that he purchased. We will talk about that later. There are payments behind on that. You can see there is nearly \$1,500 in payments past due on the motorcycle at this point.

Then the Bridle Path house is a particular concern. The Bridle Path house is owned by the estate. It was conveyed by Mr. DeMocker to the estate. That is consistent with the divorce settlement where Carol Kennedy was going to wind up with that house. But the estate didn't have the funds and continues not to have the funds to pay this debt, so Mr. DeMocker was advancing money to the estate, essentially, to pay the Bridle Path mortgage.

The two huge problems are: That hasn't been able to happen since he was arrested, and the value of

that Bridle Path house has probably dropped by at least 50-percent. The \$250,000 represents the larger of two short sale offers received recently for the property. We calculate that it would probably take closer to \$500,000 in a sale price for the estate to simply break even at this point. In real estate terms, the estate and by extension Mr. DeMocker are significantly upside down in both of these properties, the townhouse and the Bridle Path house.

In addition, if you just look at the standard net worth calculations, he has a negative net worth without Bridle Path of \$186,000, just taking assets over liability. If you put the Bridle Path house back into play, it is even worse. His negative net worth with the Bridle Path in its entirety, meaning the first and second, it is \$386,000.

The middle one is the Bridle Path home equity line of credit, which I said a minute ago was Mr. DeMocker's sole and separate obligation. It is in his name only. So whether you consider him to be the de facto borrower in both mortgages or just one, he is still considerably upside down on a financial basis, however you want to calculate it.

The point of this, Judge, is that one of the considerations under the statute is the financial picture of the defendant. The State has made at various times,

including to the grand jury, allegations that Mr. DeMocker has hidden assets, transferred assets, but has not to this date produced any proof of which assets they are talking about and where they are or where they believe they are.

And we have said all along, and Anna Young said, that when those allegations were made during the divorce, Mr. DeMocker and Anna Young quickly and thoroughly and completely responded showing where every penny went.

The situation isn't very difficult.

Mr. DeMocker's entire compensation, all of his earnings for a number of years now have been derived from his employment.

He has no other source of income. There is no money off shore. There is no money in another bank account.

There is a differed compensation package, which consists of 9,000 shares of UBS stock that once upon a time was worth perhaps \$600,000. The last time we looked, which was in the last few days, UBS was trading at \$8 a share, so it is about \$70,000 now. That money is not available to Mr. DeMocker's family, because it hasn't vested yet. It will vest, if at all, a year from now, and the condition is that Mr. DeMocker continue to be employed by UBS and continue to be in good standing during that period of time.

Which leads to another critical problem.

Mr. DeMocker's licenses to practice his profession are

contingent upon a number of things, not the least of which is that he be free from any judgments, personal bankruptcies, seizures by creditors, or any other adverse financial actions. That is understandable. He is financial advisor, and there is a public interest in making sure the financial advisors can keep their own finances in order.

One of the concerns has been all along not knowing if and when Mr. DeMocker would be out of jail to try and keep this ball in the air, at least to the extent of trying to avoid foreclosures and lawsuits and repossessions. And we have been able to do that so far, but the clock is running down on us, and the foreclosure is looming on the Bridle Path first in just a few weeks here. We are not sure what we are going to be able to do.

But the hope is that Mr. DeMocker is released from jail, not that he could go back to work at UBS until the case is over, until he is acquitted at the end of the case, but at least the hope is that we can create some savings in the family by not having to have other people care for his children that would allow us to have small amounts of money to throw at some of these creditors to at least keep them backed up and away from foreclosures and away from lawsuits.

This is a difficult situation made particularly difficult by forces beyond our control regarding

the real estate market and the securities market. That is a view of Steve DeMocker's finances. He has no income or assets from which he could contribute any amount of money toward a bond in any amount. So he is entirely dependent on others.

So if I could show you the next possible set of players in this case, Your Honor, it is his siblings. You have seen, although I don't think you have been introduced to many of his siblings, Steve is the oldest of nine children. His brother Jim is in the back of the courtroom at the right. He is next in line. He is here from Washington D.C. I asked him to come in the event that the Court had any questions. He is authorized and available to speak on some of these issues on behalf of his family. And, of course, the Court has seen Susan DeMocker at other proceedings and she is here, but there are six other siblings who all at one time or another have been present in court.

Let me give you a readable --

THE COURT: I can read it. Thank you.

MR. SEARS: I am just projecting here. I

couldn't read it.

THE COURT: I understand.

MR. SEARS: I assume that everybody else is as

24 | blind as I am.

This is an attempt, Judge, to sort of

give you a snapshot, without the kind of detailed line item information about each of the siblings. They have a number of things in common. None of them are anywhere as well off financially as Steve was prior to his arrest. All of them have for one reason or another significant issues in their own personal lives.

For the most part they have children.

And you can see, for example, looking at Sharron, who is the second oldest daughter. She is a physician, but she is about to adopt a special needs child on her own, and has a debt service for her own medical practice, which she has had to limit somewhat because of the needs of this adoptive child, and considerable medical school debt. It is just an example.

Jim, who is here, works for the federal government, lives outside of Washington D.C. Has a daughter in college and a son that is certainly college bound. A mother-in-law who has considerable needs that they are assisting with. They have a home and mortgages and the kind of debt that you would expect that goes with that sort of lifestyle.

Sue, I think it is really not fair to call her unemployed. It is technically correct, but I mentioned to you Sue had a very good position at Columbia University as an investigator there that she, essentially, gave up to come out here when Steve was arrested, to be here

for his children and to help us with the case. She has three children of her own, and I have spent a fair amount of time with her oldest daughter, who is now living abroad, but is coming back. She has her own student loan, and clearly has no cash available for any part of this project.

Dan lives in the Washington D.C. area.

He has a young family, and I met with him in December at some length when I was back in D.C., and we spent a lot of that meeting talking about just how miserable the building economy was in Washington D.C. and how he went from really managing projects to being a headhunter trying to find knew jobs for his company during that period of time.

Mary has been here a number of times.

She has young children. She has a disability. She was a classical harpist. She played the harp, and she can't do that anymore. They are terribly affected, as are all of the DeMockers, by the downturn in the economy. They have no substantial savings. They have no other assets. They are struggling to get by on their own now to the point where she can't even afford health insurance for her family.

Michael is a newspaper photographer for the New Orleans Times Picayune. He is married, has a son, a young son. His wife has had some large uncompensated medical bills. They had a home that was there when Katrina hit, and just like most of the other residents of New Orleans, those

people whose houses were spared found that the value of their houses -- I hate to be corny -- but the house values went under water. And that's the reality that Mike is facing now.

Donna and Judy, the two youngest girls. Judy bought a home with some other people. She took on all the debt, and has only a fraction of the equity there and is living paycheck to paycheck. Donna has a contract that runs out this summer with no guarantee of future employment after that, and her family has spent a considerable amount of money in a custody battle over her husband's son, her stepson, which is on-going and which has already run substantial legal bills.

This is the reality. The money that has come thus far for maintaining Steve's family and trying to pay some of the expenses that I just talked to you about, and paying the significant and substantial legal defense fees, all the related costs, the experts that the Court has heard from, of course, the attorneys and paralegals and the support staff, the investigators, the mitigation specialists, all the other people that are on the team, that money has come from Steve's parents, who are the last possible source here. And, frankly, there could be a day, Your Honor, there could be a day down the road when the cost of this case will outrun the collective finances of all the DeMockers.

And I will tell you that Dr. and

Mrs. DeMocker, whom I know the Court has seen in court before, has essentially said they will sell everything, they will liquidate everything they have on Steve's behalf. It is a shocking concept that people at their age would basically put themselves in a position where they would have nothing. They would be at a start-over as they approach their 80's. This is their financial situation.

If you can see that, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I can.

MR. SEARS: John DeMocker, Steve's father, is 79 years old. He continues to work as a radiologist in up state New York. They have nine children, including Steve, and 14 grandchildren. He is married to Jan DeMocker, who herself is 78 years old. Considering all of the expenses they have incurred raising this big family and putting them all through school, helping with grandchildren, helping with all kinds of other things, what they had accumulated was really pretty modest. I use the word "modest" perhaps too often. It was a pretty modest portfolio, but it was something that they could retire on, and they were looking forward to doing that.

They have a home. The value was a little bit over \$400,000 before the real estate market collapsed.

It is now something less than that. They owned it free and clear, and that was going to be their retirement home. They

have now taken out a \$200,000 home equity line of credit to fund, in part, Steve's defense, so now more than 50-percent of the value of that home is encumbered with monthly payments.

They had a SEP IRA, which was invested in the market. It has taken a huge hit, somewhere between 40-and 50-percent, depending on what day you look at the statement. If they took that money out, they have to pay tax on it when they get it. It was a SEP IRA, so it was tax deferred, the earnings were tax deferred, but once they withdraw it, it goes into their tax return subject to income tax.

They have an annuity that pays them a modest amount that has a locked in death benefit. If they liquidated that, it is subject to a penalty, and it has also taken a big hit as a result of the downturn in the market.

They have some long-term life insurance that has riders for long-term personal care and home care and a modest cash value, which they have vowed to cash out, which means they would be left without any long-term insurance and would have to rely on family or other people to take care of them if they became disabled.

They have a small cash account, less than \$10,000, and then some stocks, which have taken a big hit. A lot of their stocks were held -- were UBS stocks, so they

went on the same downward ride that Steve's deferred compensation package went on. He has no pension. He has been a self-employed physician for 50 years.

They have this credit union home equity loan as a liability that I just talked about. They were helping with a disabled grandchild's Special Ed tuition.

That can't do that anymore. They have the current and future legal expenses and defense costs.

They may need medical care and assisted care. They are in remarkably good health at this point, but they are 79 and 78 years old. They would need to live, somehow, if they were able to retire, even if they sold their house. During my last long conversation with them, they both told me personally that if it came to it, they would sell their house to keep this thing going.

Mrs. DeMocker is an ordained minister. She retired more than ten years ago. She has the same basic financial situation. She has a few of her own assets. She has about \$5,000 in a savings account. She had some stocks that were worth \$90,000 on February 28, again 40- to 50-percent less than they were worth the same time a year ago, and they continue to drop.

She has her own long-term life insurance policy with the same long-term care and home health care rider with a modest cash value if it were surrendered.

She does have a pension. There are two small accounts totaling about \$45,000, and they are all of the same liability. This is the circumstances for Steve's parents, and now you have seen the combined circumstances.

There is really nobody else out there.

There are no additional pots of money. Family members,

particularly siblings, have said if they could, they would

consider borrowing money themselves to help fund this, but

that is the circumstances. That is where we are financially.

It puts the family in an impossible position, Your Honor, and I will talk about this more toward the end, but the impossible decision is going to be if the bond were reduced to some makeable level, they would still be faced with the decision of taking a steadily diminishing pile of money that was put aside for Steve's defense and using part of that for a non-refundable bond premium. And the idea of having to keep Steve in jail for as long as it takes to bring this case to trial because they can't afford to do otherwise is a crushing decision on the family, particularly on his parents. And knowing that if money were no object, Steve could have been home six weeks ago is a terrible thing for parents to have to think about, but they think about it every day.

The estate of Carol Kennedy, of course, has no connection to Steve. The divorce took care of that.

The estate itself has its own liquidity and solvency problems. I monitor that somewhat, and there are a lot of obligations. There are tax obligations. There are creditors of Carol's, which were not — who were not paid because she died before the money that came out in the divorce settlement was used to pay off some of these other creditors. They filed creditor claims. They have to be paid. So that's the financial situation, Your Honor.

I want to talk, if I could, about the flight risk allegations. The principal allegation about Steve DeMocker as a flight risk comes from the story about these books that he ordered from Amazon.com. I have provided Mr. Ainley with an excerpt from a police report which was disclosed to us and has the State's Bates stamp number on it. This is a portion of the report.

What happened is that when Steve was arrested in October, the police came down, he was sitting in his office in Phoenix at work, and they came down and they told him, essentially, that he was under something they called "investigative detention," and that they wanted to talk to him and that depending on his answers, he would either be arrested or something else.

We don't think that is true at all. We think they came there to arrest him. We think they just wanted to take a statement from him, and he gave them a

statement. And one of the things that he said is in this excerpt. It has to do with the books. This is after he has been confronted by armed and uniformed police officers who were clearly there to arrest him, and he tells them what this is about.

The books are really pretty trashy. They are sort of pulp mass market paperbacks, and they were ordered -- two of them were found in a mini storage unit. So you can see how much value Mr. DeMocker was placing on that information. He threw them into a mini storage. None of them were scanned. There were no dog-eared or underlined pages. Some of them were never opened.

The circumstance is that this is the middle of August. In that six-week period between the time that his former wife and the mother of his children was murdered, Mr. DeMocker was questioned and not charged and then basically kept in the dark. The police and the County Attorney's office went into an information lock down. They sealed all of the search warrant affidavits. They, with the assistance of the medical examiner, prevented the disclosure of the autopsy report for that period of time. There was no information coming out about any of this.

Instead, we were trying to do an investigation because it seemed, particularly from statements in the press, that if Mr. DeMocker was not the only suspect,

that he was likely to be a significant suspect. So we attempted to do some kind of an investigation. And what we learned and what we shared with Mr. DeMocker was that there seemed to be a circle of people, including Jim Knapp, who were going on-line, sending out e-mails, telling circles of people what a bad person Mr. DeMocker was, that they were sure he had done this, wild stories about prior domestic abuse that no one except for those people had any reason to believe happened; not the children, not Mr. DeMocker, not Carol's real friends, people she had known. These were just people on the outside looking in.

And there was a particularly disturbing episode where somebody called and said they knew Carol, talked to Mr. DeMocker, said that they had psychic abilities, and that they had channeled the discussion with Carol, and Carol had talked to them about how Steve didn't do this. And that person then apparently contacted the police and the police sent somebody out to interview her.

So the state of mind with Mr. DeMocker and with the rest of us that were involved in this case in August was a great deal of uncertainty. It appeared to us that the police were looking desperately to find information in this case. We didn't know and they weren't sharing where they were looking, what they were doing, who they were talking to, so we had to rely on this sort of gossip and

information.

We had already begun to paint a picture of Mr. Knapp as a very unstable person, a person that was trying to shake down the estate for money, had his own personal problems, had problems in his own marriage, problems with his own children, and it looked to us like Mr. Knapp was giving the police information. Mr. Knapp told us that he had provided the police with a theory of what happened. The police told him that it was a great theory. Mr. Knapp was given control of the house within 24 hours after the body was discovered before the police had, apparently, even checked out his alibi for that night.

They searched Mr. DeMocker's townhome several times, but they never searched in any meaningful way the guesthouse where Mr. Knapp was living on the property. The Court's heard the testimony from Detective Brown that they were there 15 to 20 minutes and took some photographs and didn't look around. So Mr. DeMocker's state of mind was concerning in July and August that something was happening.

Mr. DeMocker would tell you, as he told the police officers, that he was scared. And he had talked to somebody and they said, well, you could always run away and hide, and he had, being a pretty thorough person, sent away for these books, looked at them and never acted on them.

The key factor here is that two months

after these books were delivered, Mr. DeMocker is right where everybody knows he will be. He is sitting at work, wearing a necktie, going to work every day, living in the same place, has a new passport, has not used it, has not been out of the country, and has done nothing whatsoever, has moved no money anywhere, out of the country, other banks, to Switzerland, anyplace. He has done nothing that would make anyone think that he was actually acting on the idea that he could run away.

His girlfriend, Renee Girard, who is in the back of the courtroom, was interviewed by the police after his arrest, and they asked her about these books, and she said she thought they were a joke. They were there. It was something he thought about and quickly discarded.

They always talk about a person's actions speaking louder than their words, and the truth is

Mr. DeMocker didn't go anywhere. He didn't go anywhere. He hired a lawyer. He hired an investigator, and he was doing his best to try and prevent his worse nightmare, which would be that he would be arrested without probable cause, and that he would be arrested based upon incomplete and premature evidence, and that came true. That is why we are here today. That has been our position all along in this case.

Mr. DeMocker applied for another passport, Judge. And here are the circumstances surrounding

that. Much was made at the *Simpson* hearing by the State of his application and even a suggestion that he committed a crime.

I have here in my hand, Judge, this is what was left by the police at Mr. DeMocker's townhome after the first search. I didn't make a copy of it, because it doesn't photograph well. I think it is the third item from the bottom. You can sort of make out the word "passport." And here is what happened.

The police came -- the police talked to Mr. DeMocker that night at length. While they were talking to Mr. DeMocker, they were writing search warrants, including a search warrant for his townhome. The search warrants were executed early that morning. They were signed by Judge Markham about 7:30 that morning, and Mr. DeMocker was told that he couldn't go back to any of those locations until the police gave him the all clear. This document was left by the police that day.

I now realize what happened. Two things. I collected this document. Mr. DeMocker didn't have it, and I didn't make a copy for him because it is basically illegible. What happened was I started asking the police by the next week for a legible copy. And they didn't give it to me. And eventually about two-and-a-half weeks later, I struck a deal with the sheriff's office where I was allowed

to go to their office and sit there, and they dictated to me what was on -- I would say, I can't read this item number, and they would dictate to me and I would write out what it said.

But when Mr. DeMocker was applying for his duplicate passport, at the same time he was applying for a driver's license, credit cards, buying new underwear and socks, trying to make arrangements because they had his car -- he was trying to put his life back together again -- he didn't have this document, and even if he did, I am not sure whether a reasonable person could look at this and say that is a receipt for my passport, but I had it, and I didn't give him a copy, and that is the circumstance at that point.

Mr. DeMocker didn't use that passport.

He didn't go anywhere that required a passport from the time he got it in July until the time he was arrested in October.

The State will see that when it is unsealed. It will see there are no stamps on the passport and there are no records of him crossing the border during that period of time.

The other thing that the State has pointed to is a motorcycle that he had that was packed and had some GPS maps for Mexico and some camping supplies and a loaded handgun. The State knows that Mr. DeMocker had that handgun for more than ten years. He bought it at Bucky O'Neill's pawn shop here in Prescott. And the camping gear

and the motorcycle were replacement transportation.

Mr. DeMocker also had leased a car from time to time -- not really leasing it. He was renting it on a daily basis or short-term basis if he needed to travel by car, but that motorcycle was his principal form of transportation, and you can see that he went out and bought that.

The idea that Mr. DeMocker was planning some sort of international get-away is a real head scratcher for us, Judge. That his clever plan to flee the jurisdiction would be to get on a bright, shiny, big silver BMW motorcycle with a sliver motorcycle helmet and his girlfriend on the back and drive to Mexico is hardly, in our view, worthy of serious discussion that that was a plan that he was going to escape on this motorcycle. A non-Mexican appearing gentleman like Mr. DeMocker was going to get lost in Mexico on this motorcycle. It just doesn't make any sense. It was how he got around. Family members know that he had talked for years about getting a motorcycle. This was an opportunity or him to do that.

He was spending more and more time in Phoenix. He had rented an apartment for his daughter who was working in the Obama campaign at that point, and had a base of operations in Phoenix and an office in Phoenix during that period of time.

The last thing I want to talk about is GPS monitoring and pretrial services, Judge. I know we are running short of time here.

We had proposed, and we still propose that the Court consider ordering GPS monitoring as a way to ameliorate the high bond that the Court had previously set. If the purpose of bond is to ensure Mr. DeMocker's appearance, GPS monitoring is highly successful. I provided some information, and here is a copy of a brochure from the company in Maricopa County that does monitoring for Maricopa County pretrial services.

And they provide different levels. They have landline, cell phone and then GPS, which they describe as being appropriate for the highest risk individual. It is the best technology.

What we propose, your Honor, is this:

Looking at the statutory factors and the way they apply here,

Mr. DeMocker, has, of course, no prior criminal history.

He's lived in Prescott for over 20 years. He owns two pieces

of property, or owned two pieces of property in Prescott.

He's never failed to appear, obviously, and has no residence

outside Yavapai County, Arizona, has no money or funds.

The Court has previously found that he is bondable, which means that the Court found in January that the State could not meet the proof evident, presumption great

standard. I will tell the Court that our view is that this grand jury determination and subsequent indictment doesn't raise that bar at all, and I think when the Court reads the transcript and sees our motion, the Court will have its own view of the weight of the evidence, but it hasn't shifted significantly. There is no new game changing evidence at all.

He has strong family ties. We know much about that. He has the possibility of employment. He has no financial resources. His character — the State can say all they want about his womanizing, but in terms of his commitment and love for his own family and his family's love for him, it couldn't be clearer. It just couldn't be clearer. And the State has attempted to damage his character and reputation as part of their case against him, but it is just that. It is just an attempt.

There are no drug issues in this case.

And we think that if you balance all of this together, Judge, this is what I think might make sense. I recognize we were asking the Court to take a great leap of faith with us here. But we think we could afford a bond, both in terms of the non-refundable premium and collateral in the range of \$250,000. And if you couple that with GPS monitoring that is tied to a pretrial services supervision order where the Court can have the monitoring company report

to a pretrial services office, to the Court directly, if you want to, to Mr. Ainley, we don't care. We really don't care who gets that information. It can be provided immediately if there is any anomaly in the system.

We would ask for the right to be in Yavapai and Maricopa County so that he could be available to work on his own case, a large part of which is centered in Maricopa County, but we would be open to suggestions of a tighter geographical restriction, if the Court thought that was appropriate.

You can see from that statement, Steve had said he is not going anywhere. Again, actions speak louder than words. He has, from the time he began to realize he might be a suspect, done all of the right things. He has stayed around. He has retained counsel. He has defended himself, and he intends to see this case through and be acquitted and be reunited with his family.

There is some precedent recently for setting a bond in that range. The Fraijo case that Judge Hess just completed last week involved a defendant who had, apparently, six prior felonies. The least of them were prior drug convictions. The State's evidence against Mr. Fraijo was by all accounts, including the conversation I had with the prosecutor, much stronger. He made damaging admissions to a number of people. He was on a surveillance video in the

presence of the victim shortly before the murder. He was charged with capital murder. He was convicted of capital eligible murder, and the jury sentenced him to life. His bond was set at \$300,000. He also had connections out of the country. None of those things seem to apply in any way to Mr. DeMocker. Maybe most importantly the quality and the weight of the evidence against him is so different from the evidence against Mr. Fraijo.

The other point is, if the Court is concerned, \$250,000 bond, if forfeited, would be devastating to the DeMocker family, individually and collectively. It would be unthinkable for Steve to put his family in that position of running away and expecting them to eat a \$250,000 bond. They can't do it. It would be devastating to any one of them or them collectively.

If the premium -- if the bond were set at a higher amount, the premium, if it were paid, would draw down in a devastating way on the money available for the defense to the point where at some not to distant date

Mr. DeMocker might be indigent and unable to defend himself at private expense, and the cost to the county and the tax payers would be significant if he were to be given appointed counsel. We hope it doesn't come to that.

But we think a combination of a bond in that range, Judge, and the GPS monitoring, which is

high-tech, remarkably accurate, and essentially tamper proof, would do everything the Court would need, I would think, to assure itself that Mr. DeMocker would be here for court.

Most of all, he is not going anywhere.

He is not going to leave his family and his children in his wake wondering if he was guilty, having to live with that fact. He will stand and he will fight these charges, and he will be vindicated. We are confident of that at the end, Your Honor. All of that is inconsistent with a man that would consider for a minute running away. He had those thoughts, and that is all they were. They were simply thoughts, and as he said, they were fear based and stupid. And he realized that, essentially, as soon as he took the books out of the package and looked at them. He said he could never do that, and he would never do that in this case.

I think this is reasonable. I think if the Court wanted to order pretrial services on some level to monitor and require him to report in person, to call in, to do anything that they required and the Court required, that is all fine. There is no condition of that sort that we would not agree to. There is simply nothing about that we would consider unreasonably burdensome. It is simply the amount of the bond that is keeping Mr. DeMocker where he is now.

He has been in jail and away from his

family and his children for four-and-a-half months. He needs to be home. They need him. The case against him does not rise to the level where it is a certainty that if the door opened he would be gone unless he were held on a huge, unmeetable bond. All of this, I think, can be resolved in the way I proposed. I would ask the Court to make those modifications.

I have Jim DeMocker here to answer any questions that the Court might have. If the Court wants additional detailed financial information, we can provide that to the Court. If the Court wants to hear from the GPS monitoring provider beyond the information, I can do that. My sense is that's a program that is tested and available and can be done and has a great success rate.

The last thing: There is one other thing about the flight issue I should point out very simply. The Courier ran an article several weeks before the arrest. I don't think we will ever know whether it was planted by the police or not, but the article said, in essence, that an arrest was imminent, that they were waiting for one more piece of important blood evidence and then would make an arrest.

If it was intended to spook Mr. DeMocker into running, it had exactly the opposite effect.

Mr. DeMocker was sitting in his office when the police

contacted him, and he knew about that article and read it, 1 2 and knew that it wasn't true, and they were not going to find any blood evidence, because his wasn't there that night. 3 4 That is exactly the kind of circumstances 5 you would expect if a person really thought they were going 6 to get caught would have prompted them to head for the 7 border, and it had just the opposite effect on Mr. DeMocker. 8 I think that this case is going to take 9 some period of time to resolve. It would be stunning to the 10 family to have Mr. DeMocker remain in jail while this case 11 was pending. It would be heartbreaking. It would be 12 terrible for his family and terrible for his children, and a 13 terrible burden on Mr. DeMocker, and I ask the Court to make 14 these modifications. 15 Thank you. 16 THE COURT: Who controls Carol Kennedy's 17 estate currently? Who is executor? 18 MR. SEARS: Katie DeMocker. Christopher 19 Kottke represents her in that capacity. 20 THE COURT: Insurance payouts on Carol 21 Kennedy? 22 MR. SEARS: There were two life insurance

MR. SEARS: There were two life insurance policies taken out about ten years ago as part of an overall estate planning effort. There were larger policies on Steve's life. Those policies had -- one of them -- both of

23

24

25

them had Steve as beneficiary on her death. One of them had, 1 2 as a contingent beneficiary, a trust in Carol Kennedy's will 3 for the girls, and at the time what is now Wachovia 4 Securities, was A.G. Edwards, was the trustee and there were 5 restrictions on the money being distributed until the girls were 25. And the second policy, the \$500,000 policy, had no 6 7 contingent beneficiary designation. Hartford has taken the 8 position that they will not distribute the money to 9 Mr. DeMocker unless and until he is acquitted in this case. 10 THE COURT: So there hasn't been any 11 distribution to anyone? 12 MR. SEARS: No. 13 THE COURT: I recall one was \$500,000. 14 other was --15 250. MR. SEARS: 16 THE COURT: Thank you. That was some of the evidence I heard. 17 18 MR. SEARS: The \$500,000 policy, the absence 19 of a contingent beneficiary, I think -- I have been told by 20 people that are smarter than me -- that it would then have to 21 go, if at all, into Carol Kennedy's estate for the benefit of her other creditors. 22 23 THE COURT: Mr. Ainley. 24 MR. AINLEY: Yes, sir. 25 Judge, I would like to put back up the

first poster board that Mr. Sears had up here, and point out, Judge, that while finances are one of the factors that the Court is to consider in determining release conditions, what the Court is normally required to do is look at somebody who is stable. Somebody who has a job, has a house in the community, is a low flight risk because they have ties.

And what we are looking at here is somebody who is \$386,000 in debt and getting deeper in debt every month and living paycheck to paycheck. The testimony of Anna Young was that he had two vehicles and essentially a deferred comp program, or a retirement program, so he was financing all of this paycheck to paycheck.

Mr. Sears has pointed out, and I think I heard him say, he is not going to be allowed to work -- or go back to work at UBS as a financial consultant, and though later on he said he has possible employment, didn't mention what that was. It is probably raking leaves somewhere, because UBS isn't going to take him back, and he thinks he is going to make enough money doing something else, flipping burgers, raking leaves to finance this.

And what you have here, Judge, is a situation where more than one person has just walked away saying this is a hopeless cause at this point in time, and if I am in somewhere else, then I am judgment proof because they can't find me.

So there is no explanation for where these finances are going to come from that are going to enable Mr. DeMocker to pull the rabbit out of the hat and keep this going.

Additionally, Judge, the fact that it is an inconvenience to his family is not one of the factors to be considered by the Court. Murder is pretty inconvenient, too. Getting killed is pretty inconvenient, but inconvenience isn't one of the factors.

So as far as the finances go, Judge, I don't think there is anything here that simply because he doesn't have other people that are willing to put up the money to help him out is not a reason to lower the bond.

As to his siblings, he says nobody there is as well off as Mr. DeMocker. I hope that is not true because, apparently, Mr. DeMocker is just shy of \$400,000 in debt, and I hope they are in better condition than he is, but it still doesn't make a difference what their finances are concerning Mr. DeMocker's situation.

Lastly, as far as the finances go, it says that his parents are willing to put up money. You know, one of the ways that Mr. DeMocker could relieve that problem -- there are two ways. He could plead guilty, or he can run away, and then his parents aren't going to be putting out any more money either for the defense or for anything

else for that matter because he will be gone.

Defense counsel says, well, gee, Judge, he is not really a flight risk. But that is not what Charlotte said in her journal. Said, my dad is planning on running away. Does it get any more clear than that? Does that need explanation that Mr. DeMocker was seriously considering leaving and that Charlotte knew about it. He at least shared it with Charlotte.

Jacob's statement about the motorcycle was that Mr. DeMocker said that he had the motorcycle in case he needed to get away in a hurry. Mr. Sears says he just bought that for transportation, but then he also outfitted it with metal saddle bags and had supplies and a gun. The commute down in Phoenix is bad, but I don't think it is that bad that he has got to have a gun and supplies and a GPS map of Mexico. And last time I checked, planes fly into Mexico, and Mexico is a pretty good jumping off point if you want to go somewhere else.

The books and the passport also speak for themselves.

Lastly, Judge, it says that the ankle bracelet would provide GPS monitoring. Looking at the BIK study that Mr. Sears just handed to me a little while ago, second page, the results: 2, jail beds are reserved for serious defendants. An important feature considering

overcrowding issues in Maricopa County facilities. Last time I checked, first degree murder with an allegation of death penalty is a pretty serious matter, and Mr. DeMocker fits into the category of serious defendants. And apparently their view is that serious defendants should be in jail beds rather than on GPS monitors, because what a GPS monitor tells you, Judge, is that when it goes off, go close the barn door because the horse is already gone. It doesn't tell you what the person is planning to do. It doesn't tell you anything except where he is up until the point where he cuts it off with the bolt cutters and then he's gone. It doesn't tell you where he went, doesn't tell you what his plans were. It just tells you he is gone, and too bad. Now you have got to go and find him. GPS monitoring is a joke.

It can be used for very low risk offenders, guys who are serving out time, who are just going to make their lives worse if they take off. But when you are facing a first degree murder, death penalty case, it doesn't get any more serious. A Class 5 failure to appear is not going to worry you a whole lot.

I find it very interesting that Mr. Sears argues today, Judge, that Mr. DeMocker when he heard about the newspaper article or saw the press release and heard that an arrest was imminent, says today he decided it was no big deal and he was going to stick around and he is here, and yet

at the end of the *Simpson* hearing, Mr. Sears argued exactly the opposite, that that is why he got the stuff, because he was freaked out after that article and started collecting up all of these items so that he could flee in the future.

I point out that the books -- the testimony at the *Simpson* hearing, Judge, was that the books ordered by Mr. DeMocker were ordered on Mr. DeMocker's own Amazon account from his own computer -- or from a computer at the house that he rented.

This is a man -- Mr. Sears says, well,

Judge, he never acted on these things. Well, he got the
motorcycle with the saddle bags. He gathered up all the
supplies. Got the gun from wherever he had it, and had it
with the supplies and the saddle bags, not the usual place
you store a gun. Bought the GPS map of Mexico in October.

Bought the books. Got the passport replacement. Told

Charlotte that he was going to run, so that she noted it in
her journal. Told Jacob that he got the motorcycle so that
he could get away fast if he needed to. What part didn't he
act on? The only thing he didn't do is actually get on the
motorcycle and run. But what does that say about how far

Mr. DeMocker is willing to go? He was ready to go.

Judge, the bond as currently set is entirely appropriate, given the circumstances of this case.

Mr. DeMocker needn't worry about those finances, because he

is going to be judgment proof here pretty soon. And he can't go back to work. He doesn't have a source of income. He is not going to be able to pay these debts. He has already acted on things to make himself a flight risk and put himself in a position to run. And GPS monitoring only tells you when he is already gone.

For all those reasons, Judge, the motion to reconsider release conditions should be denied.

THE COURT: Mr. Sears.

MR. SEARS: A couple of things.

Working backwards. The concept of GPS is different than the ankle bracelet technology that Mr. Ainley is talking about that just has basically an off-on. The GPS device is a tracking system. It is constantly sending a signal to a satellite that is constantly monitoring real time by the company. And they not only know when he takes it off, they know where he is going.

on Page 2, they talk about having, in Maricopa County, three different kinds of monitoring system. One for clients with tradition landline phones. One with clients who only have cell phones. And then for certain high risk defendants, the agency is using a GPS tracking system. That is what we are proposing. A tracking system that actually allows whomever cares to look at it, which would always be at a minimum the

monitoring company, who would be under a court order to provide information to the Court or the pretrial services people or anyone else that the Court wanted involved in that, that actually can see where Mr. DeMocker is going, and I have been told it is plus or minus five feet. They will know plus or minus five feet where Mr. DeMocker is 24 hours a day. That is powerful information. It is not the kind of program that Mr. Ainley is trying to describe.

Mr. DeMocker isn't going to be able to go back to work for UBS. He has a PhD. He's taught. He can teach. He can consult. He can write. Perhaps most significantly, he can work on his own case, which works a great savings to the family in terms of additional support to the defense team and would lessen the possibility that Mr. DeMocker would run out of money for his own defense if he were available to work on his own case. In addition, the cost of the defense would go down, because of the ease in talking to Mr. DeMocker rather than getting in a car and driving to Camp Verde every time he needs to be consulted about something.

I think Mr. Ainley is reading the statute a little too closely. As I read 13-3967(a)(4), among the factors are the accused's family ties, employment, financial resources. And I think financial resources must mean, in Mr. DeMocker's case, not only his own lack of ability to

contribute, but also the corresponding ability of his parents and siblings to contribute. That is the reason why I provided the Court with this information.

I didn't say, contrary to Mr. Ainley's remarks here, that Mr. DeMocker was currently better off. I am quite sure that I said that prior to his arrest Mr. DeMocker was the most successful of his siblings.

Clearly that is no longer true.

The point I was trying to make was simply that none of the DeMockers, from the parents on down, individually or collectively, are so flush that they could fund his defense infinitely and post a two-and-a-half million dollar bond, or anything even remotely approaching that number.

Nonetheless, the question is what would it take to keep Mr. DeMocker around and showing up for court. And as I said, I think it is unthinkable that the family would risk their dwindling resources on Mr. DeMocker's bond if they thought for a minute he was going to run away, and it is more unthinkable and unspeakable to imagine that Mr. DeMocker would do that to his family. This is a tight-knit, loving, large family that knows what they know, and has a deep and abiding belief in Steve's innocence, and there is no way in the world that Steve DeMocker would let down his family financially, that he would run away and

expect his family to eat any kind of a bond in his case. That is something that is beyond Mr. DeMocker's comprehension.

The reason that Mr. DeMocker was trying to make these payments, and the family has been trying to keep them, was to preserve his career. He has the potential of earning millions of dollars if he is able to go back to his work as a stockbroker in the future. That is becoming more and more speculative. As time goes by, the economy changes in a different way. But there is clearly a huge value to Mr. DeMocker in being able at some point to resume his career.

But the most important reason he needs to get out is because he doesn't belong in jail. The State's evidence against him is nothing like Mr. Ainley would suggest it is, and the Court knows that. The motorcycle was not purchased after that newspaper came. The camping gear, the gun, the passport, none of those things were acquired in October. Mr. Ainley knows that. Those things — the passport was replaced within the first week as part of a program to replace all of what the police took, which they still have, including his car. The motorcycle was purchased in early August. It has camping gear. That is not escape gear.

The gun had to live someplace, and

Mr. DeMocker to this day doesn't know who killed his ex-wife. And we are not entirely sure how Mr. Knapp died. That is a matter which the Prescott Police Department appear to be continuing investigating. I don't think it is unreasonable for Mr. DeMocker to have thought it was not a bad idea to have some self-protection, particularly during the times when Katie was going to be living in that apartment and he was not there. That was the reason that the apartment was rented, for her to have a place to live during the campaign.

The suggestion that he is going to be raking leaves, apart from the cynicism of that and the sarcasm attached to that, just isn't true. He has the ability to earn something, and he has the ability to help save money by working in his own defense.

The journal entry from Charlotte was dated August 17. We've asked for that. We are not sure whether there are other journals or other information, but that was within a couple of days of when the books arrived. Mr. DeMocker was talking openly about, should I just run away? Are they going to arrest me without any evidence? And clearly, the decision was made not to do that.

To claim that that is proof positive that he had a plan that he was going to act on is inconsistent with the evidence in this case, Judge. Mr. DeMocker didn't run away. He didn't intend to run away, and he doesn't

intend to run away now. The question is what do we need to do, what does the Court have to do to ensure his appearance.

I don't think keeping him in jail is the only answer. I think Mr. DeMocker can be released on the conditions that I have proposed. And all of us, even Mr. Ainley, should feel confident that his whereabouts will be monitored and known. There would be a huge disincentive financially for him, because of the devastation on his parents and his family if he were to flee.

Most importantly, Mr. DeMocker doesn't want to live the rest of his life with the idea that other people out there think that he ran away because he was guilty. His wouldn't ever in a million years do that to his children or to his elderly parents or to his brothers and sisters or to the other people who care about him.

He will stand. He told the police, it is right there in the report, that he is going to stand and fight these charges. He meant it then, and he means it now. That is what he will do.

But this is all we can do, Your Honor, within the financial resources of the extended DeMocker family. This is all we can manage, but it is plenty. It is plenty, and it is more than enough to be sure that he will come to court. He has done everything that he needs to do in terms of defending himself that I can imagine, and it is

inconceivable, to me on a personal level, that Mr. DeMocker would throw it all away and try to run. First of all, he would be caught. But more than that, it would be inconsistent with everything that he has said and done for many months now.

All he has admitted to is all he should have to admit to, is that he had moments of panic in the dark at night. And from his perspective and my perspective, his panic and his fear came true.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Sears.

I am going to take this matter under advisement. This, I think, was the only setting that we had on the calendar for Mr. DeMocker's case.

MR. AINLEY: It is, sir.

also as a pretrial. Obviously, I recognize you have some opportunity now to file the motion for new determination of probable cause, but do you want to continue from today to a particular pretrial conference setting, and are you willing to exclude time for purposes of that? Do you want to set the matter for a trial? What do you want to set next?

MR. SEARS: I don't think we are anywhere close to knowing what a trial would look like in this case, Your Honor.

We sent Mr. Ainley yesterday a two-page

letter asking for supplemental disclosure, a lot of which is 1 2 just usable materials as opposed to what we were given. CDs 3 that we can open and play, documents that we can read. kinds of things. I just have no sense of how long the trial 4 5 is. My thought would be to set a pretrial 6 7 out -- if you consider that we are going to file the motion 8 on or before the 24th, and you layered onto that the response 9 and reply time and then set it for argument, maybe we can do 10 a pretrial conference on a day for argument. Maybe even conceivably pick a day to argue that motion now, if the Court 11 12 is prepared to do that. 13 THE COURT: Might make some sense. 14 MR. SEARS: Yes, we would waive time to get to the pretrial conference for sure. 15 16 THE COURT: April 21 would seem to be far enough out to get the information, the response, the reply. 17 If I put you on Tuesday, April 21st, if you are available and 18 19 in town --20 MR. SEARS: That is fine. 21 THE COURT: -- could we do that, plus have a 22 pretrial conference at that point? 23 MR. AINLEY: Yes, Judge. That is fine. 24 MR. SEARS:

THE COURT:

25

It is ordered setting a pretrial

conference and argument, if a new motion for probable cause is filed, for Tuesday, April 21st, 2009, at 9:00 a.m. is excluded between now and then under Rule 8 with regard to the trial. MR. SEARS: If there is anything that the Court would like from us to supplement the materials or anything else, we would be happy to do it. Just let us know. If you want more information about monitoring or anything else, we can make that available. THE COURT: Thank you. Appreciate that. That motion is under advisement. You can reflect that in the clerk's minutes. Stand in recess.

CERTIFICATE

I, ROXANNE E. TARN, CR, a Certified Reporter in the State of Arizona, do hereby certify that the foregoing pages 1 - 59 constitute a full, true, and accurate transcript of the proceedings had in the foregoing matter, all done to the best of my skill and ability.

SIGNED and dated this 22nd day of September, 2010.

